

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 27, 2003 in which claims 1-20, 22-24, 26, 28 and 29 were rejected and claims 30 and 31 objected to.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita (U.S. 6,611,285) in view of Petelin et al (U.S. 5,436,542), the Examiner states that Morita discloses "one or more second displays, ... responsive to said n-axis attitude control signal for executing n-axis second display motions ..." pointing to column 11, lines 62-67 and column 12, lines 1-8. However, the passages cited by the Examiner and Fig. 13 do not show that the second display execute n-axis second display motions. Although the second displays of Morita show movement of the point-of-view of the images as displayed by the second displays, this is different from the second displays "executing n-axis second display motions". The Examiner is evidently interpreting "second display motions" as meaning motions of the point-of-view of the images on the second displays. But that is not what is claimed. The language in claim 1 says "second display motions". This means display motions not image motions or changes in the point-of-view from which the images are taken. Morita's displays are stationary and it is only the video images or their point-of-view that move or change, not the displays.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct an indefiniteness problem and to make it clear that the n-axis sensor could include a mouse rather than only a first display that has its motions sensed. In other words, referring to Fig. 2, the first user could use the mouse 134 instead of the combined attitude sensor 62 and HMD 56 or some other n-axis sensor.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 1 is requested.

* * *

Regarding the novelty rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-19 based on Morita, again, there is no showing of attitudinally actuating a display or guiding a viewing attitude of a user. All of the display devices of Morita are stationary. Therefore, the novelty rejection of claim 2 is incorrect and since claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2 and include all of the limitations of claim 2, they are necessarily novel as well at least for the reasons given above.

Regarding independent claim 6, the applicant agrees with the Examiner and has amended claim 6 to include the limitation that the video signals are displayed on a display connected to an n-axis display platform that executes attitudinal movements and a display connected to the n-axis display platform responsive to video signal and an attitudinal display control signal for displaying images corresponding to the attitudinal movements indicated by the attitudinal display control signal and for guiding a user's head to execute attitudinal movements.

Regarding independent claim 15, the applicant agrees with the Examiner and has amended claim 15 to include limitations similar to those added to claim 6 which claims an n-axis display platform for guiding a user's head.

Morita's displays are all stationary and do not show this feature. Withdrawal of the novelty rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-19 is requested.

Regarding the novelty rejection of claim 5 as being anticipated by Gallery (U.S. 5,900,849), as far as applicant can tell, Gallery is not of record and withdrawal of the novelty rejection based on Gallery is requested. Even if Gallery were of record, it does not show an n-axis display platform that guides a user's head to execute attitudinal movements. The alarm signal is simply, as the Examiner says, to help the user avoid a

dangerous area and not to guide the user's head to execute attitudinal movements. Once hearing the alarm, the user's head is not guided anywhere.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 5 is requested.

Regarding the novelty rejection of claims 22-24, 26 and 28-29 based on Pye (U.S. 5,634,622), the Examiner is correct to say that Pye shows a sensor 130 in Fig. 2 but this sensor is not a sensor for sensing rotations. Rather, it is a sensor for sensing infrared radiation from the remote 140.

Regarding claim 29, the same may be said for that claim with regard to the sensor 130 of Pye. Moreover, there is no third platform part within which any second platform part is rotatably mounted in Pye. For that to be the case, the box-shaped base 12 of Pye would have to be rotatably mounted within another platform part. The same may be said for claim 22 as it relates to its independent claim 28. Regarding the dependent claim 26, Pye nowhere shows or even suggests display view ports on the display for use by a user in placing eyes thereon.

Regarding dependent claim 24, there is no third axis in Pye. Regarding dependent claim 30, there is no sensor shown by Pye and there is no rotation of the box-shaped base 12. Regarding dependent claim 31, it depends from claim 30, just discussed above, and there is no third platform part, no rotations of the base 12, no sensor for sensing such rotations and no third access about which the second platform part rotates.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claims 22-24, 26 and 28-29 is requested.

The new claims 32-33 are reintroduced (formerly claims 25 and 27) which were to be the subject of a divisional application so that this case could go to allowance. However, applicant has decided to reintroduce these claims with the request to the

Examiner that if the former rejection based on Smith (U.S. 5,153,716) at Figs. 14 and 15 thereof is to be reasserted, that a clearer explanation of how the Examiner sees the various axes of rotation claimed in new claim 32 being present in Figs. 14 and 15 of Smith. As far as applicant can see, there is only rotation about one axis (the axis of the pole 300). While there is permissible linear movement along the axis of the pole 300, there is only rotation possible about the axis of the pole and no other platform part which is capable of rotation about any other axis.

The objections and rejections of the Official Action of October 27, 2003, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-20, 22 and 24, 26 and 28-33 to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

/mo
January 27, 2004
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building 5
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234